

**SPORT DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE OF CANADA (SDRCC)
CENTRE DE RÈGLEMENT DES DIFFÉRENDS SPORTIFS DU CANADA (CRDSC)**

DOPING APPEAL TRIBUNAL

**IN THE MATTER OF AN ANTI-DOPING RULE VIOLATION ASSERTED BY THE
CANADIAN CENTRE FOR ETHICS IN SPORT**

NO: SDRCC DAT-24-0019

BETWEEN:

CYCLING CANADA CYCLISME (CCC)

(APPELLANT)

AND

CANADIAN CENTRE FOR ETHICS IN SPORT (CCES)

(PARTY)

AND

TAREK DAHAB

(PARTY)

AND

UNION CYCLISTE INTERNATIONALE (UCI)

(PARTY)

AND

WORLD ANTI-DOPING AGENCY (WADA)

(PARTY)

Appearances:

On behalf of the Appellant:	Kris Westwood, Mathieu Boucher and Mitchell Tucker
On behalf of CCES:	Annie Bourgeois, Counsel
On his own behalf:	Tarek Dahab

DECISION

1. The Sport Dispute Resolution Centre of Canada (“SDRCC”) was created on March 19, 2003, by the *Physical Activity and Sport Act* (S.C. 2003, c.2). Under the *Act*, the SDRCC has exclusive jurisdiction to provide a national alternative dispute resolution service to the sport community. In 2004, the SDRCC assumed responsibility for all doping disputes in Canada.
2. On April 1, 2024, I was selected under subsection 5.3 (b) and 9.7(a) of the *Canadian Sport Dispute Resolution Code* (the “Code”) to hear Cycling Canada Cyclisme’s (“CCC”) appeal of a February 12, 2024, decision of the Doping Tribunal. In that decision, Arbitrator Patrice Brunet determined that Tarek Dahab (the “Athlete”) had committed an anti-doping rule violation and imposed a four-year suspension.
3. CCC appeals the decision, seeking a reduction of the sanction to one year.

BACKGROUND

The Parties

4. The Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport (“CCES”) is an independent, non-profit organization that is responsible for administering the Canadian Anti-Doping Program (“CADP”), including the provision of anti-doping services to national sport organizations and their members. As Canada’s national anti-doping organization, the CCES follows the World Anti-Doping Code (“WADC”) and its mandatory International Standards. The CCES has implemented the WADC and its mandatory International Standards through the CADP, the domestic rules that govern this proceeding.
5. The CADP applies to all members of, and participants in the activities of sporting organizations adopting it. The WADC and the CADP are designed to protect the integrity of sport and the rights of clean athletes.
6. CCC is the national governing body for the sport of cycling and paracycling in Canada and is a member of the International Cycling Union (“UCI”), the world governing body of cycling. It has adopted the CADP.
7. Tarek Dahab (the “Athlete”) is a now 51-year-old athlete in the sport of para-cycling.
8. The World Anti-Doping Agency (“WADA”) is the international organization responsible for administering the World Anti-Doping Program, which includes the WADC.
9. Parties to a proceeding before the Doping Appeal Tribunal are the athlete or other person against whom the CCES asserts an anti-doping rule violation, the CCES and the relevant sport organization (in this case CCC). The UCI and WADA may attend the hearing as observers if they wish (*Code* Subsections 9.9(a) and (b), CADP Rule 13.2.2.1.4). Neither WADA, the UCI nor the Government of Canada participated as observers.

The Code and the CADP

10. The SDRCC has the jurisdiction to constitute and administer a Doping Tribunal and a Doping Appeal Tribunal, which is obliged to conduct all hearings in accordance with the CADP Rules as informed, where necessary, by the WADC (Rules 8.1.1 and 13.2.2 of the CADP).

Background

11. The Athlete was an officer with the Montreal City Police Service for 22 years. In 2019, he was a recipient of the Governor General's Police Exemplary Service Medal, which is awarded to police officers who have completed 20 years of full-time service for serving in an exemplary manner with impeccable conduct.
12. On April 14, 2017, while riding his bicycle, the Athlete was struck by a vehicle which caused him serious injuries, including a traumatic brain injury. He underwent many surgical procedures on his back, neck and wrists. The Athlete was placed on sick leave as a result of his injuries and eventually retired from the Police Service in 2020. Since his retirement, he has been involved in a wide range of community activities.
13. The injuries significantly impacted the Athlete's quality of life. He suffered from several medical conditions including severe headaches, loss of muscular strength and sleep problems. In August 2021, the Athlete was prescribed Testosterone which greatly improved the sequelae of some of his injuries, in particular, severe migraine headaches.
14. Testosterone use is prohibited at all times (its use is prohibited both in and out-of-competition) under Section 1.1 of the WADA 2023 Prohibited List.
15. The Athlete began competitive para-cycling at the end of 2022 and became a member of the Quebec sport cycling federation (Fédération québécoise des sports cyclistes or "FQSC"), a member organization of CCC. As a competitive para-cyclist, Mr. Dahab is bound by the CADP.
16. Through discussions with a CCC coach in February 2023, the Athlete became aware of the requirement to have a Therapeutic Use Exemption ("TUE") for his continued use of Testosterone if he wanted to compete. The Athlete submitted his first TUE request to the CCES on February 23, 2023. In its correspondence acknowledging the Athlete's application and informing him that the application was incomplete, the CCES advised the Athlete that:

[Translation]

If, at any time, you are added to your International Federation's (IF) Registered Testing Pool (RTP) or attend an international event, it is your responsibility to ensure that you meet any additional TUE requirements imposed by the CCES or your IF.

17. The CCES communication also provided the Athlete with a hyperlink to additional information on medical exemptions.

18. The CCES submitted the Athlete's request to the Therapeutic Use Exemption Committee ("TUEC") and on June 14, 2023, informed the Athlete that his application had been denied and recommended that he be evaluated by a specialist.
19. On June 12, 2023, CCC notified the Athlete that he had been selected to the Canadian Team for the 2023 World Para-Cycling Championships. On July 18, 2023, CCC informed the Athlete of his requirements for the world championships, including the completion of anti-doping education modules.
20. The Athlete submitted a second TUE application to the CCES on August 3, 2023. He was notified on August 15, 2023, that it had been refused because it did not contain sufficient information.
21. On September 1, 2023, CCC selected the Athlete to participate in the Parapan American Games and reminded him of the necessity to complete his anti-doping education training.
22. On September 28, 2023, the Athlete submitted additional information to the CCES in support of his TUE application. The CCES informed the Athlete that since his previous application had been denied, he had to submit a new application.
23. On October 12, 2023, CCC informed the Athlete that he had been added to the CCES National Athlete Pool ("NAP") and reminded him of his anti-doping educational requirements, including the status of medications and TUEs. CCC provided the Athlete with information in order to complete anti-doping courses. CCC's letter to the Athlete also informed him that:

Some prescription and over-the-counter medications are included on the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) Prohibited List. The Prohibited List is an international standard identifying substances and methods prohibited in sport. Medications can be prohibited in-competition, out-of-competition, or in particular sports.

You should be aware of the classes of substances that are on the Prohibited List, and be careful to check the status of any medication you consume to ensure that it will not result in a positive test.

24. The Athlete ultimately completed the anti-doping online course on October 13, 2023. As part of that online course, the Athlete received education on, among other things, the Prohibited List, the doping control process, CADP violations and sanctions, and the risks associated with the use of substances on the Prohibited List prior to obtaining a TUE.
25. On October 19, 2023, in correspondence with the Athlete regarding his intention to reapply for a TUE, the CCES reminded him about the risks of taking prohibited substances without a valid TUE:

[Translation]

The CCES is taking this opportunity to remind you that the continuity of your participation in sport in the absence of a valid TUE can lead to serious consequences, including the risk of an adverse analytical finding if you are subject to a screening, which could lead to an anti-doping rule violation (ADRV). This is all the more important if a TUE is ultimately not granted for the use of the substance in question (as with your previous applications).

26. The Athlete submitted his third TUE on October 20, 2023, and at the same time, notified the CCES of his intention to compete in the Parapan American Games which were scheduled for November 2023.

27. On November 2, 2023, the CCES informed the Athlete:

[Translation]

If you are tested, you might otherwise face an adverse analytical finding that would result in a provisional suspension and could mean that you will not be able to participate in the Para Pan American Games.

28. On November 6, 2023, the Athlete submitted additional medical information to the CCES, which the CCES then considered complete.

29. On November 8, 2023, the Athlete began taking himself off Testosterone.

30. On November 13, 2023, the Athlete underwent out-of-competition testing which gave rise to an Adverse Analytical Finding (“AAF”) for Testosterone and its metabolites.

31. On November 14, 2023, the TUEC refused the Athlete’s request for a TUE on the basis that the medical information did not support a finding that Testosterone was medically required. The Athlete communicated the refusal to CCC which in turn sought clarification from the CCES.

32. On November 15, 2023, the CCES informed the Athlete and CCC of the consequences associated with an AAF and the risks of an anti-doping rule violation (“ADRV”) if the Athlete continued to take Testosterone. CCC removed the Athlete from the Parapan American Games team.

33. On December 20, 2023, the CCES asserted an ADRV against the Athlete for the presence and use of a prohibited substance, Testosterone and its metabolites within the meaning of Rule 2.1 (Presence) and 2.2 (Use or Attempted Use) of the CADP and sought a sanction of a four-year period of ineligibility, pursuant to Rule 10.2.1.1 of the CADP.

34. The Athlete was provisionally suspended.

35. The Athlete sought a hearing at the SDRCC in response to the assertion. He admitted having committed an ADRV for the presence of a prohibited substance, that is, Testosterone and its metabolites and sought a sanction of a period of ineligibility of one year.

The Doping Tribunal Decision

36. Having admitted the ADRV, the sole issue before Arbitrator Brunet was the appropriate sanction.

37. At the hearing, the Athlete argued that he demonstrated no fault or negligence. He contended that he acted with due diligence and took every precaution to comply with the CADP. He argued that he demonstrated transparency and kept both CCC and the FQSC informed of his use of Testosterone for therapeutic purposes. He also asserted that, as he was new to the sport of para-cycling, he relied on the advice of the experts at CCC and the FQSC and at no time was he ever told to stop using Testosterone so that he could compete at provincial, national or international events.

38. Arbitrator Brunet found that the Athlete committed an ADRV pursuant to Rule 2.1.2 of the CADP, as admitted by the Athlete.

39. Arbitrator Brunet found that the Athlete had not been able to demonstrate that the ADRV was not intentional within the meaning of 10.2.3 of the CADP and that a four-year suspension was appropriate under Rule 10.2.1.1. He also determined that there were no exceptional circumstances justifying the elimination of the four-year suspension.

APPEAL

40. Section 7.9 (d) of the *Code* affords a Party the right to appeal a decision of a Doping Panel pursuant to section 9.3. Section 9.3 provides that decisions of a Doping Panel imposing consequences may be appealed to an Appeal Panel as provided for in Rule 13 of the CADP. CADP Rule 13.2.2 provides that where an athlete is not an international level athlete, appeals are to the SDRCC Doping Appeal Tribunal.

41. I held an oral hearing on June 7, 2024, and on June 14, 2024, issued my decision to deny the appeal with reasons to follow, in accordance with Article 7.9 of the *Code* and CADP Rule 8.3.1.

Arguments

42. CCC argues that Arbitrator Brunet failed to properly consider mitigating factors and international decisions related to intent and the Athlete's admission of his use of Testosterone. CCC also argues that Arbitrator Brunet failed to consider a reduction to the Athlete's period of ineligibility.

43. CCC also contends that Arbitrator Brunet failed to properly consider the Athlete's lack of intent and degree of fault according to Rule 10.2.3 of the CADP, and specifically, that he did not consider the provisions of Rule 10.7.2.

44. CCC submits that the Athlete did not understand that he did not have a provisional exemption to use Testosterone during the TUE application process. It contends that the language of the CCES correspondence was unclear, particularly because it did not explicitly specify that the Athlete should not have competed given that he was taking Testosterone.
45. CCC says that, in the absence of clear and explicit communication, the Athlete was unaware he was committing an ADRV and that there was a risk associated with continuing to compete.
46. CCC contends that the Athlete has established that his use of Testosterone was for therapeutic purposes and that there was no intention to commit an ADRV. As such, it argues that the Athlete's period of ineligibility should be reduced to one year under Section 10.2.3. of the CADP.
47. The CCES argues that the Athlete has not established, on a balance of probabilities, that his ADRV was not intentional. It contends that the Athlete has conceded that he voluntarily and knowingly took Testosterone, and in doing so, engaged in conduct which involved a significant risk of committing an ADRV and ignored that risk.
48. The CCES submits that, as the Athlete has acknowledged taking Testosterone, the only issue before the Tribunal was whether he demonstrated that his ADRV was not intentional according to Rule 10.2.3 of the CADP. CCES contends that the Athlete did not argue, or present any facts, to support a finding that the ADRV was not intentional.

DECISION

Relevant Regulatory Provisions

49. Rule 3.1 of the CADP and Section 7.7 of the *Code* provide that the CCES has the burden of establishing that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing body, bearing in mind the seriousness of the allegation. Where the CADP places the burden of proof upon the Athlete to rebut a presumption or establish specified facts or circumstances except as provided in Rules 3.2.2 and 3.2.2, the standard of proof is on a balance of probabilities.

CADP

50. There is no dispute that the Athlete committed an ADRV in taking Testosterone without having obtained a TUE. I accept that the Athlete was first prescribed Testosterone in August 2021 to alleviate symptoms he experienced from the injuries he sustained in a cycling accident. There is no dispute that he continued to take Testosterone until he began to discontinue its use on November 8, 2023.
51. Testosterone is a non-specified substance. (Rule 4.2.2 of the CADP). As such, a period of ineligibility of four years must be imposed on athletes for a first ADRV (CADP Rule 10.2.1.1)

52. The CADP provides for reductions to the four-year period of ineligibility in certain circumstances, where an athlete can demonstrate, on a balance of probabilities, that he did not intentionally commit an ADRV:

10.2.1 The period of Ineligibility, subject to Rule 10.2.2 shall be four (4) years where:

10.2.1.1 The anti-doping rule violation does not involve a Specified Substance or a Specified Method, unless the Athlete or other Person can establish that the anti-doping rule violation was not intentional

53. The CADP establishes the principle of strict liability on athletes for substances found in their samples, whether or not the athlete intentionally used the substance or was negligent or otherwise at fault. I find, as Arbitrator Brunet did, that the Athlete committed an ADRV through his use of Testosterone without a TUE.

54. There is no dispute that the Athlete was transparent about his use of Testosterone and made some effort over several months to obtain a TUE. I accept the Athlete's assertion that this transparency demonstrated that his use of Testosterone was for therapeutic purposes and an absence of any "intent to cheat." However, the CADP defines intent as:

As used in Rule 10.2, the term "intentional" is meant to identify those Athletes or other Persons who engage in conduct which they knew constituted an anti-doping rule violation or knew that there was a significant risk that the conduct might constitute or result in an anti-doping rule violation and manifestly disregarded that risk. (Rule 10.2.3)

55. I find, as did Arbitrator Brunet, that the Athlete knew that he was taking Testosterone, a prohibited substance. I also find that the Athlete knew, or ought to have known, that his continued use of Testosterone might result in an ADRV and that he manifestly disregarded that risk.

56. The Athlete testified that he was aware well before this process, because of his interest in cycling, that competitive athletes were not permitted to take Testosterone. It was only through this process that he became aware of the consequences of doing so. The lack of an awareness of the consequences of taking a prohibited substances does not constitute a lack of intention for the purposes of Rule 10.2.3.

57. The Athlete was informed by a CCC coach as early as February 20, 2023, that if he wanted to compete, he should apply for a TUE for his use of Testosterone. The Athlete made his first application on February 23, 2023.

58. The CCES website contains helpful information about anti-doping requirements and athlete obligations. The Therapeutic Use Exemption portion of the site clearly states that if an athlete is required to take medication that is on WADA's prohibited list, a TUE will provide the athlete with authorization to take the medication.

59. The TUE application itself seeks the Athlete's consent to the disclosure of personal health information for the purpose of evaluating a TUE request. The Athlete said that he understood he was applying for a TUE, but that he did not understand that he had to

cease taking the medication while his TUE application was being processed. He said that he assumed his application would be approved since he was taking Testosterone for a therapeutic purpose.

60. I cannot agree with CCC's assertion that the Athlete understood that he had a "provisional" TUE, or that his TUE was "pending." None of the information sent by the CCES suggested that the Athlete would receive a TUE. In fact, given that his first application was denied, the Athlete ought to have been on notice that the TUEC was not satisfied with the information provided.
61. Although the Athlete said he did not fully appreciate the consequences of an ADRV, that information was fully available to him. He did understand that he was at risk of serious consequences, including a suspension, if his sample returned an AAF.
62. I accept that the Athlete may have misunderstood the correspondence from the CCES regarding the processing of his TUE application. However, even if he understood that his TUE was "pending," all the information available to him made it clear that until he possessed a TUE, he risked returning an AAF.
63. Furthermore, the TUE application form itself expressly outlines the purpose of the TUE application as well as the fact that the submission of the application and supporting documentation does not guarantee that a TUE will be granted. The Athlete acknowledged that he understood there was no guarantee that his TUE application would be approved and that he did not ask that the TUE be approved retroactively.
64. Indeed, as Arbitrator Brunet noted:

The TUE applications submitted by the Athlete demonstrate that he recognized the need to obtain authorization to compete while self-administering Testosterone. (at para. 113).
65. In its correspondence to the Athlete acknowledging his first application, the CCES provided the Athlete with links to additional resources and cautioned him about the necessity to follow all relevant regulations. After selecting the Athlete for inclusion on national and international teams, CCC reminded him about his obligations in the NAP, including completing anti-doping training modules.
66. Consequently, I find the Athlete knew, or ought to have known, as early as February 23, 2023, that the taking of Testosterone was prohibited when pursuing activities within the scope of the CADP unless he had an exemption.
67. Although the Athlete was only selected to the national team and required to complete anti-doping education some months later, he had the knowledge and resources to educate himself about the risks of committing an ADRV approximately eight months before he was subjected to out-of-competition testing. Certainly, by October 13, 2023, the date the Athlete took the anti-doping training course, he knew, or ought to have known, of the risks of an ADRV.

68. Even after completing the CCES anti-doping training course on October 13, 2023, the Athlete continued to take Testosterone even though his TUE application had not been granted.
69. In my view, had the Athlete not entirely appreciated the risks of continuing to take Testosterone while his application was under review up to that point, he ought to have appreciated the risks by October 13. If he was still under the misapprehension that he could compete while taking Testosterone without a TUE after taking that training, in my view, CCES's correspondence of October 19, 2023 was clear and unambiguous:
- [Translation]*
- The CCES is taking this opportunity to remind you that the continuity of your participation in sport in the absence of a valid TUE can lead to serious consequences, including the risk of an adverse analytical finding if you are subject to a screening, which could lead to an anti-doping rule violation (ADRV).*
70. Despite this warning, the Athlete did not begin to discontinue his use of Testosterone for several more weeks. I am not persuaded that the Athlete's ADRV was unintentional, as defined in the CADP.
71. Furthermore, the Athlete's submissions clearly indicate that he communicated his intention to continue competing while his TUE application was being reviewed. In my view, these submissions demonstrate the Athlete's decision to 'manifestly disregard the risks' that his conduct might result in an ADRV.
72. I also agree with Arbitrator Brunet's comments (at para. 115) that, as an adult and former police officer, the Athlete is fully capable of reading and understanding the rules applicable to his sport, and as such, could not have been unaware of the risks associated with taking Testosterone without obtaining a TUE, considering his communications with the CCES and the anti-doping education.
73. I accept the Athlete's contention that he did not intend to cheat. However, it is not his lack of intention, as that term is commonly understood, which is applicable in this proceeding. Furthermore, although the Athlete asserted that his use of Testosterone was for therapeutic reasons, the purpose of a TUE is to ensure that both the medication and the dosage, while of therapeutic benefit, does not confer on him an undue competitive advantage.
74. Although I appreciate the Athlete's argument that the TUE process was cumbersome and overly bureaucratic, that does not displace my conclusion that he knew, or ought to have known that there was a substantial risk he would commit an ADRV if he continued to take Testosterone without a TUE.
75. I find, as did Arbitrator Brunet, that the Athlete has not demonstrated that his ADRV was not intentional.

76. I also disagree with CCC's submission that Arbitrator Brunet failed to consider a reduction in the period of ineligibility based on no significant fault or negligence. It is clear that Arbitrator Brunet considered, and rejected, this possibility:

This [Fault] notion requires the Athlete to demonstrate that, even with the utmost vigilance, he did not know, did not suspect or could not reasonably have known or suspected that he had been administered a prohibited substance. These elements are not present here. The Athlete admits that he was self-administering Testosterone and that he knew that this substance required a TUE, as it is normally prohibited. The defense of good faith and transparency, although commendable, is not admissible according to the CADP. (at para. 124).

77. Once intention has been established under Rule 10.2.3, there is no reduction to the four-year sanction.

78. I have considered the cases of *FEI v. Katarzyna Milczarek* (FEI Tribunal decision C23-0052) and *Marin Cilic v. International Tennis Federation (ITF)* (CAS 2013/A/3327) relied upon by CCC in support of its appeal and find them of little assistance. *Cilic* establishes levels and degrees of fault in determining appropriate sanctions. Given that the Athlete has not successfully rebutted the presumption of intent, there is no basis to assess his level or degree of fault. In *Milczarek*, the athlete had little to no anti-doping education, she was not informed about the process for obtaining a TUE, she was not aware she was taking a prohibited substance or that her behaviour would result in an ADRV, and there was no evidence that she ignored the risk that her behaviour might result in an ADRV.

79. I have also noted the cases of *Koubek v International Tennis Federation* (CAS 2005/A/828), *FINA v. GADA & Eastern Europe RADO & Irakli Bolkvadze* (CAS 2017/A/5392) and *WADA v TFF & Ahmet Kuru* (CAS 2016/A/4512) relied upon by the CCES.

80. In *Kuru*, the athlete took medication for which he sought, and had been denied, a TUE. The Arbitrator found that the athlete's conduct in taking that medication after he had been warned of the risks of doing so, constituted a significant risk.

81. In *Koubek* and *Bolkvadze*, the athletes were found to have exercised no diligence in taking supplements that were later determined to have contained prohibited substances. In the present case, the Athlete took Testosterone intentionally knowing that it was a prohibited substance.

82. Arbitrator Brunet also offered some comments which appeared to imply that the FQSC and CCC bore some responsibility for the Athlete's ADRV (at para. 114). Those comments were not central to his analysis and appear to have been made without the benefit of any submissions by CCC at the hearing. While I am unable to amend Arbitrator Brunet's award, I would not endorse his comments based on the evidence at this hearing.

Reduction to period of ineligibility under Rule 10.7.2

83. CCC contends that the Athlete's period of ineligibility should be reduced under Rule 10.7.2 of the CADP. That Rule provides that where an Athlete:

...voluntarily admits the commission of an anti-doping rule violation before having received notice of a Sample collection which could establish an anti-doping rule violation...then the period of Ineligibility may be reduced, but not below one-half of the period of Ineligibility otherwise applicable.

84. I am unable to find this provision helps the Athlete, since he did not admit an ADRV before having received notice of his November 2023 sample collection. In my view, this provision is intended to assist an athlete who becomes aware of circumstances that would likely lead to an ADRV and notifies the relevant anti-doping authority of those circumstances without the anti-doping authorities having knowledge of that possibility. In this case, the Athlete knowingly took Testosterone without receiving a TUE despite being warned on a number of occasions about the possibility that this conduct exposed him to the risk of an ADRV. Although the Athlete was fully transparent about his use of Testosterone, he did not admit that he committed an ADRV until January 12, 2024, in his submissions to the Doping Tribunal. Up to that date, the Athlete asserted that he believed he followed all anti-doping rules.

85. While not binding on me, I also note the comments to CADP Rule 10.7.2:

This Rule is intended to apply when an Athlete or other Person comes forward and admits to an anti-doping rule violation in circumstances where no Anti-Doping Organization is aware that an anti-doping rule violation might have been committed. It is not intended to apply to circumstances where the admission occurs after the Athlete or other Person believes he or she is about to be caught....

86. I have also considered the case of *Sabina Ashirbayeva v. International Gymnastics Federation* (CAS 2018/A/5913) in which the Arbitrator determined that the defense of voluntary or prompt admission does not apply in cases where the ADRV is based on AAFs rather than any admission, and where the admission is made only during an appeal of the asserted ADRV. I agree, as to find otherwise would defeat the purpose of the CADP.

CONCLUSION

87. The appeal is denied.

88. I wish to thank the parties for their thorough and helpful submissions. While the result may be disappointing to Mr. Dahab, as I noted at the hearing, he has established himself as a valuable member of the community and I hope he continues to engage in the sport and non-sporting world.

DATED: June 19, 2024, Vancouver, British Columbia



Carol Roberts, Arbitrator